9 April 2014

English only

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
Fortieth session
Bonn, 4–15 June 2014

Item 7 of the provisional agenda
The 2013–2015 review

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Fortieth session
Bonn, 4–15 June 2014

Item 16 of the provisional agenda
The 2013–2015 review

Views on the future work of the structured expert dialogue, including the further use of different sources of information

Submissions from Parties

1. The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, at their thirty-ninth sessions, invited Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 26 March 2014, their views on the future work of the structured expert dialogue, including the further use of different sources of information.[1] They requested the secretariat to compile the submissions into a miscellaneous document.

2. The secretariat has received two such submissions from Parties. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are attached and reproduced* in the language in which they were received and without formal editing.[2]

---

[1] FCCC/SBSTA/2013/5, paragraph 135, and FCCC/SBI/2013/20, paragraph 169.

* These submissions have been electronically imported in order to make them available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the texts as submitted.

[2] Also available at <http://unfccc.int/5901.php> and <http://unfccc.int/5902.php>.

FCCC/SB/2014/MISC.1
GE.14-60648

Please recycle

Contents

		Page
1.	Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and United States of America (Submission received 28 March 2014)	3
2.	Greece and the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its member States* (Submission received 27 March 2014)	5

* This submission is supported by Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia.

Paper no. 1: Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and United States of America

2013-2015 Review

Submission on behalf of Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and the United States of America

Views on the future work of the SED, including the further use of different sources of information

March 2014

This submission is written on behalf of Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and the United States of America. This submission responds to the invitation from the SBSTA and the SBI at their 39th session to submit views on the future work of the Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) to the 2013-2015 Review, including the further use of different sources of information.[1] This submission should be read alongside our submission containing views on how the Review will inform the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) which is being submitted concurrently.

The 5th Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is a key input for the Review[2], particularly given the role of the IPCC in providing a comprehensive and authoritative assessment of climate change science and the fact that the release of AR5 coincides with the 2013-2015 Review. Additional sources may be useful to assist the work of the Review if they are relevant to the mandated scope, and are scientifically and technically robust.

We would like to recall that the SED is mandated to ensure the scientific integrity of the Review, and should focus on considering the most relevant and robust scientific and fact-based information and literature. As such, the co-facilitators of the SED should ensure the content of the SED is focused solely on expert presentations, questions by Parties and follow-up dialogue based on expert-to-Party exchanges. We suggest the following guiding questions, themes and inputs could usefully assist the work of the SED in 2014 and 2015:

I Adequacy of the long-term global goal, in light of the ultimate objective of the Convention

Suggested Inquiries

1. Observed trends in extreme events and projected changes to those extremes under a 1.5°C, 2°C and higher warming scenarios, including regional experiences, responses and variability;
2. Observed and projected changes, including regional variability in: freshwater resources; terrestrial and inland water systems; oceans; polar systems; coastal systems and low-lying areas; urban areas; human health; energy resources and systems; and food production systems and food security under various warming scenarios;

[1] Document FCCC/SB/2013/L.1 paragrpah 9.
[2] Decision 1/CP.18 paragraph 82.

3. Key climate-related vulnerabilities, risks, and benefits to natural and managed ecosystems (and their related services) and human settlements under various scenarios of future change.

Suggested Inputs

1. AR5 WGII
2. AR5 WGIII
3. AR5 Synthesis Report (when it becomes available in Oct 2014)

II Overall progress made towards achieving the long-term global goal, including a consideration of the implementation of the commitments under the Convention

Suggested Inquiries

1. What are the global trends in historical, current and future GHG emissions and ambient concentrations including mitigation pathways for meeting the long-term global goal?
2. What are the key drivers of trends and projections of global GHG emissions and subsequent radiative forcing – by sector, region and gas?
3. What are the existing commitments, actions and plans and their aggregate mitigation potential, and what is the uncertainty around the mitigation potential?
4. What are the sector-specific emissions trends, mitigation potentials, technologies and investment patterns (energy, AFOLU (agriculture, forestry and other land use), industry, transport, buildings)?
5. How can we maximize climate policy co-benefits and reduce adverse side effects?
6. What have been the most cost-effective and efficient low cost abatement opportunities to date?
7. Based on technology development trends, a) what are the low-cost abatement opportunities that can be pursued in the near term? b) What are currently the higher-cost opportunities that are not yet commercially viable but could hold significant abatement potential over the longer-term?
8. What policies and measures appear to be driving emissions reductions or show success/promise that should be emulated?
9. What role can be played by sub-national authorities (e.g. commercial sector, cities and states, etc.) in reaching the long-term global goal and creating enabling environments?
10. How can long-term policy effects, such as investments in innovation technologies, be evaluated?

Suggested Inputs

a. AR5 WGIII
b. AR5 Synthesis Report (when it becomes available in Oct 2014)
c. Biennial Reports and Biennial Update Reports (discussed together in June 2015)
d. National Communications from Parties
e. ADP Work Stream 2 technical paper "*Updated compilation of information on mitigation benefits of actions, initiatives and options to enhance ambition.*"
f. Publications from other relevant international bodies (such as IRENA's *Global Renewable Energy Roadmap 2030 (REMAP2030)* and the International Energy Agency's *World Energy Outlook)*

Paper no. 2: Greece and the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its member States

SUBMISSION BY GREECE AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AND ITS MEMBER STATES

This submission is supported by Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia.

Athens, 26 March 2014

Subject: The 2013-2015 review:

- **Views from Parties on the future work of the SED, including the further use of different sources of information**
- **Views from Parties on how the outcomes of the review will inform the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP), as requested by decision 1/CP.17, paragraph 6.**

The European Union and its Member States welcome the opportunity to respond to the conclusions of the SBSTA and the SBI inviting Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 26 March 2014, their views on the future work of the SED, including the further use of different sources of information, and requested the secretariat to compile these submissions into a miscellaneous document.

It also welcomes the invitation to Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 26 March 2014, their views on how the outcomes of the review will inform the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP), as requested by decision 1/CP.17, paragraph 6.

The EU's response to both invitations is provided below.

1. Future work of the SED

The EU considers that the Structured Expert Dialogue provides an important forum for Parties to explore the adequacy of the long-term global goal and overall progress towards achieving it. It wishes to thank the experts who presented material at the 2nd meeting of the Dialogue (SED2) for their informative and relevant contributions. The EU considers that there was a good balance between the themes of the SED at SED2. However, it considers that more opportunities should be given to the Parties to engage in the dialogue with Experts at future SED meetings. This engagement may be best carried out without differentiating parties in terms of their participation in the SED.

The scientific assessments of the IPCC have been and continue to be fundamental to the development of the multilateral climate regime under the UNFCCC, including agreement on the long term global goal. It is essential that the latest results from the IPCC AR5 are considered fully within the SED.

The EU also recognises that the work of the bodies under the UNFCCC, and other external international and regional bodies and the Parties themselves is also very relevant to understanding of the adequacy of the long-term goal and overall progress towards achieving it. In the limited time available to complete the Review process it will be necessary that the SED can have an effective dialogue with the IPCC and the other bodies that can inform the 2013-2015 Review.

The IPCC AR5 Working Group II and III reports will be available in good time for SBSTA 40. These are relevant to both themes of the Review and should both be considered fully at SED3. At least as much time should be dedicated to each of these reports as was provided for consideration of the WGI report. The IPCC AR5 Synthesis Report should be a key input to SED4 in December 2014.

The EU considers that it would be of value to seek relevant information from the Conventions on Biodiversity and Desertification and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). In addition the SED could be informed by the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), the World Bank, the International Energy Agency, UNEP and UNDP in relation to their understanding of the long term goal and progress towards it. Information from UNFCCC-related bodies such as the Standing Committee on Finance and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) has already been presented material to the SED2.

The SED should also take into account relevant information that is available from Parties via National Communications, Biennial and Biennial Update Reports, in a balanced way. We would request that the Secretariat prepare an outline analysis of what information will be available from these report to the SED for its consideration, and by when.

The EU considers that the Parties will need adequate time to reflect on the material that will have been presented in the SED. The EU considers that Parties may wish to submit their views on what has been provided to them through the SED for consideration at the June 2015 Joint Contact Group (JCG) meeting. This would point to the final SED taking place well ahead of that meeting.

2. How the outcomes of the Review might inform the work of the ADP

The EU considers that the Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) provides an important forum for Parties to explore the adequacy of the long-term global goal and overall progress towards achieving it and recognises that this is an important input to the work of the ADP.

The ongoing SED between the Parties and the experts provides an opportunity to clarify issues and challenges that we face collectively and as Parties. This process provides relevant information to Parties, which they can make use of in the on-going deliberations of the ADP. The material provided by the experts, the record of exchanges between Parties and the experts, as well as the written and oral reports from the co-Facilitators are also relevant inputs to the ADP.

The Joint Contact Group (JCG) of SBI and SBSTA will need to consider the outputs of the SED, give further guidance to the SED, and assist the COP in its mandate. The EU considers that Parties should provide submissions on these topics for consideration at its June 2015 meeting. In December 2015 the COP, with the assistance of the JCG, will need to consider the adequacy of the global goal and the overall progress towards achieving it as agreed in Cancun, Durban and Doha.

---

9 April 2014

English only

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
Fortieth session
Bonn, 4–15 June 2014

Item 7 of the provisional agenda
The 2013–2015 review

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Fortieth session
Bonn, 4–15 June 2014

Item 16 of the provisional agenda
The 2013–2015 review

Views on how the outcomes of the 2013–2015 review will inform the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action

Submissions from Parties

1. The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, at their thirty-ninth sessions, invited Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 26 March 2014, their views on how the outcomes of the 2013–2015 review will inform the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action.[1] They requested the secretariat to compile the submissions into a miscellaneous document.

2. The secretariat has received two such submissions from Parties. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are attached and reproduced* in the language in which they were received and without formal editing.[2]

---

[1] FCCC/SBSTA/2013/5, paragraph 136, and FCCC/SBI/2013/20, paragraph 170.

* These submissions have been electronically imported in order to make them available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the texts as submitted.

[2] Also available at <http://unfccc.int/5901.php> and <http://unfccc.int/5902.php>.

FCCC/SB/2014/MISC.2
GE.14-60650

Please recycle

Contents

		Page
1.	Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and United States of America (Submission received 28 March 2014)	3
2.	Greece and the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its member States* (Submission received 27 March 2014)	5

* This submission is supported by Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia.

Paper no. 1: Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and United States of America

2013-2015 Review

Submission on behalf of Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and the United States of America

Views on how the outcomes of the Review will inform the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action

March 2014

This submission is written on behalf of Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and the United States of America. This submission responds to the invitation from the SBSTA and the SBI at their 39th Session to submit views on how the outcomes of the 2013-2015 Review (the Review) will inform the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).[1] This submission should be read alongside our submission containing views on the future work of the Structured Expert Dialogue (SED), including the further use of different sources of information, that is being submitted concurrently with this one.

The Review will periodically assess the adequacy of the long-term global goal, in light of the ultimate objective of the Convention, and overall progress made towards achieving the long-term global goal, including a consideration of the implementation of the commitments under the Convention.[2]

Decision 1/CP.17 requires the ADP process to be informed, inter alia, by the outcomes of the Review. We believe that sound evidence and science provide an important platform for collective action and the next steps under the UNFCCC.

In order for the Review to effectively and efficiently inform the ADP process we offer the following views:

- Under the ADP, work is underway to negotiate a new global climate change agreement that is applicable to all and durable, and can address the long-term challenge of climate change. The ADP is also exploring ways to enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period. Given that the Review is tasked with assessing the adequacy of long-term global goal and the overall progress towards achieving it, it is well placed to inform both work streams of the ADP.
- The Review should be organized and conducted in a manner that remains relevant and useful to the work of the ADP. This means staying abreast and informed of progress under the ADP, ensuring the Review complements but does not duplicate work in other bodies and ensuring the Review is conducted in a timely manner.
- The Review has been informing the broader UNFCCC process since it began its work in 2013. Its outputs such as workshops, discussions with experts, summary reports, the co-facilitators' reports

[1] Document FCCC/SB/2013/L.1 paragraph 10.
[2] Decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 79.

to the COP, are informing Parties as they prepare their contributions for the post-2020 period and consider pre-2020 ambition. These outputs are available for the ADP to consider at any time. Moreover, we view it as each Party's responsibility to be mindful of the work done by the Review, particularly as they engage in the ADP process.

- The joint contact group of the Subsidiary Bodies runs in parallel to the work of the SED. The joint contact group provides the appropriate forum for policy discussions and is tasked with providing key milestones and timeframes for the SED, while being cautious not to micro manage its work. The SED is mandated to ensure the scientific integrity of the Review, and should focus on considering the most relevant and robust scientific information. As such, the co-facilitators of the SED should ensure the content of the SED is focused solely on expert presentations, questions by Parties and follow-up dialogue based on expert-to-Party exchanges. The SED therefore needs to focus on fact-based discussion whereas policy discussions are properly conducted under the joint contact group.
- We suggest the final output from the Review be comprised of a compilation of summary reports from workshops of the SED as prepared by its co-facilitators. This would ensure a comprehensive and accurate representation of all the discussions and findings.
- We believe the Review will be able to provide the ADP with useful and necessary information for its consideration of a new global climate change agreement that is applicable to all Parties, as well as on enhancing the level of ambition in the pre-2020 period.

Paper no. 2: Greece and the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its member States

SUBMISSION BY GREECE AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AND ITS MEMBER STATES

This submission is supported by Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia.

Athens, 26 March 2014

Subject: The 2013-2015 review:

- **Views from Parties on the future work of the SED, including the further use of different sources of information**
- **Views from Parties on how the outcomes of the review will inform the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP), as requested by decision 1/CP.17, paragraph 6.**

The European Union and its Member States welcome the opportunity to respond to the conclusions of the SBSTA and the SBI inviting Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 26 March 2014, their views on the future work of the SED, including the further use of different sources of information, and requested the secretariat to compile these submissions into a miscellaneous document.

It also welcomes the invitation to Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 26 March 2014, their views on how the outcomes of the review will inform the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP), as requested by decision 1/CP.17, paragraph 6.

The EU's response to both invitations is provided below.

1. Future work of the SED

The EU considers that the Structured Expert Dialogue provides an important forum for Parties to explore the adequacy of the long-term global goal and overall progress towards achieving it. It wishes to thank the experts who presented material at the 2nd meeting of the Dialogue (SED2) for their informative and relevant contributions. The EU considers that there was a good balance between the themes of the SED at SED2. However, it considers that more opportunities should be given to the Parties to engage in the dialogue with Experts at future SED meetings. This engagement may be best carried out without differentiating parties in terms of their participation in the SED.

The scientific assessments of the IPCC have been and continue to be fundamental to the development of the multilateral climate regime under the UNFCCC, including agreement on the long term global goal. It is essential that the latest results from the IPCC AR5 are considered fully within the SED.

The EU also recognises that the work of the bodies under the UNFCCC, and other external international and regional bodies and the Parties themselves is also very relevant to understanding of the adequacy of the long-term goal and overall progress towards achieving it. In the limited time available to complete the Review process it will be necessary that the SED can have an effective dialogue with the IPCC and the other bodies that can inform the 2013-2015 Review.

The IPCC AR5 Working Group II and III reports will be available in good time for SBSTA 40. These are relevant to both themes of the Review and should both be considered fully at SED3. At least as much time should be dedicated to each of these reports as was provided for consideration of the WGI report. The IPCC AR5 Synthesis Report should be a key input to SED4 in December 2014.

The EU considers that it would be of value to seek relevant information from the Conventions on Biodiversity and Desertification and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). In addition the SED could be informed by the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), the World Bank, the International Energy Agency, UNEP and UNDP in relation to their understanding of the long term goal and progress towards it. Information from UNFCCC-related bodies such as the Standing Committee on Finance and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) has already been presented material to the SED2.

The SED should also take into account relevant information that is available from Parties via National Communications, Biennial and Biennial Update Reports, in a balanced way. We would request that the Secretariat prepare an outline analysis of what information will be available from these report to the SED for its consideration, and by when.

The EU considers that the Parties will need adequate time to reflect on the material that will have been presented in the SED. The EU considers that Parties may wish to submit their views on what has been provided to them through the SED for consideration at the June 2015 Joint Contact Group (JCG) meeting. This would point to the final SED taking place well ahead of that meeting.

2. How the outcomes of the Review might inform the work of the ADP

The EU considers that the Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) provides an important forum for Parties to explore the adequacy of the long-term global goal and overall progress towards achieving it and recognises that this is an important input to the work of the ADP.

The ongoing SED between the Parties and the experts provides an opportunity to clarify issues and challenges that we face collectively and as Parties. This process provides relevant information to Parties, which they can make use of in the on-going deliberations of the ADP. The material provided by the experts, the record of exchanges between Parties and the experts, as well as the written and oral reports from the co-Facilitators are also relevant inputs to the ADP.

The Joint Contact Group (JCG) of SBI and SBSTA will need to consider the outputs of the SED, give further guidance to the SED, and assist the COP in its mandate. The EU considers that Parties should provide submissions on these topics for consideration at its June 2015 meeting. In December 2015 the COP, with the assistance of the JCG, will need to consider the adequacy of the global goal and the overall progress towards achieving it as agreed in Cancun, Durban and Doha.